

Exemption 6



{In Archive} Re: Summary of week's sampling

Cynthia Hutchison to: Dixon, John [USA]

04/07/2011 09:17 AM

From: Cynthia Hutchison/R7/USEPA/US
To: "Dixon, John [USA]" <dixon_john@bah.com>
Archive: This message is being viewed in an archive.

I suspect the real concern at Elkem is EPA verifying contamination rather than verifying underground utilities. We are going to have a meeting to discuss our options for next steps. It could be an administrative search warrant or we may just ask them to perform an RFI. It would be a lot cheaper for them to have let us do the investigation.

What business operations are going on at Elkem now? Does the property owner have people on site?

Cynthia L. Hutchison
Environmental/Geological Engineer
U.S. EPA, Region 7
901 N 5th Street
Kansas City, Kansas 66101
Phone (913) 551-7478
FAX (913) 551-9478
hutchison.cynthia@epa.gov

"Dixon, John [USA]"

Cynthia: Thought I'd give you a run-down of w...

04/06/2011 10:11:17 PM

From: "Dixon, John [USA]" <dixon_john@bah.com>
To: Cynthia Hutchison/R7/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 04/06/2011 10:11 PM
Subject: Summary of week's sampling

Cynthia:

Thought I'd give you a run-down of what we did this week.

1. Finally got some samples from the CW process site. We got surface waters and sediments, no problem. We got a groundwater sample from the furthest-south, existing well (from the Phase II), and groundwater samples from the property on the east. However, it's thought that groundwater flows mostly to the SW, and we couldn't get any groundwater samples from the west field. We only encountered water in a couple of holes, but the holes would not produce enough water to sample. If you need groundwater samples from the west field and/or property bounds west and south, it will likely take installing wells with an auger.

2. Dexter. Went pretty good.

3. former Elkem - you already know how that ended. This week, I talked with [REDACTED] quite a few times, and talked with the attorney on the property owner's end a few times. Last message I got from [REDACTED] was that he was sending an e-mail saying that their non-response would be considered denial of access.

One thing that might come up. When I talked with Mr. [REDACTED] counsel on Monday, he said he still wasn't sure if access could be granted. I asked if I could go ahead and call in the utility clearance (just in

case). He didn't think it was a problem, so I did. Apparently, it raised a stink onsite. I talked with the guy who does the clearances for most of the major utilities in that area. He said there is a guy onsite (he didn't know his name, but knew his company was in Buffalo, NY). He was very "who the heck is trying to sample my site" towards the utility guy, and called his boss to discuss. This was on Wednesday morning - may have contributed to the non-response to our request.

The utility guy also said that there's a ton of stuff underground (some active, some cut off). He's saying that nobody really knows what's underground. If we do go ahead with sampling at this site, we may need to bring in a 3rd party clearance crew (magnetic locate or something similar) to be sure we're not hitting anything. Utility guy said there could easily be lines underground that wouldn't be known.

I'll give you a call when I get back in the office to discuss in further detail.

John Dixon
Booz Allen Hamilton
816-448-3253
703-473-8717 (cell)